



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

of Archbishop Binius, who had Benardine and Baronius carefully before him: "Some canons of this Council are cited and alleged under the names of the Synod of Nice, either because the whole Synod of Sardica was a confirmation of Nice, and, as it were, an interpreter of it, and therefore was counted one and the same with Nice; or because the same things were decreed at Nice, but with many other things have dropped out of that Council; or in fine, because a collector, dropping the name and title of Sardica, which had been greatly defamed by the Arians, had so joined the canons of both synods that all appeared to be canons of one and the same Council of Nice. The latter reason appeared the more probable to Baronius and Bellarmine." This is the only evidence which we have been able to find that the Council of Sardica was considered by the ancients as a continuation of Nice.

THE SACRIFICE IN THE MASS AND TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

In our former article on this subject (supra p. 103), we endeavoured to show that the doctrine of the primitive Church on the subject of the oblation or sacrifice which is made in the holy communion was a very different theory from the doctrine now upheld as orthodox in the Roman Church.

In the primitive Church each communicant was expected to contribute, either in alms, or in actual oblations made in kind, to the support of the Church, and these alms and oblations were offered up on the altar, and dedicated to God by prayer in the first part of the service, before the consecration of the holy communion; and we have shewn that it was this part of the service, and this part of it only, to which the name of sacrifice or oblation was given by the ancient Church.

But the theory of Romanism proposes to our reception a totally different doctrine. According to the Roman system, the sacrifice, properly so called, does not begin until after consecration. And what is it we are to sacrifice? Not the bread and wine; not the offerings which we have made of our substance, or the first fruits of all our increase; not the alms or the oblations which we have dedicated to God; no, not even ourselves, our souls and bodies, which are the reasonable and lively sacrifice that God requires of us; but the precious Body and Blood, the Body, Blood, Soul, and Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ Himself.

This is the doctrine which Romanism would impose upon us as Catholic and Apostolic truth, and we have already endeavoured to show that the language of the ancients altogether at variance with such a doctrine—that so strange and wonderful a sacrifice was utterly unknown to the primitive Church.

We purpose now to examine the Romish doctrine itself, without reference to its agreement or non-agreement with antiquity.

For this purpose, let us first state the doctrine in the words of those who first introduced it.

Hugo de St. Victor,* a writer of the twelfth century, in his great book on the sacraments, thus defines the doctrine of the Mass, as it was held in his day:—

"Mass (*Missa*) is so called, as if it were Transmissio, or Transmission (*quasi, transmissa vel transmissio*), because the faithful people, by the ministry of the priest, who discharges the office of Mediator between the Lord and men, transmits their prayers, and vows, and oblations to the Lord. The sacred Host itself also may be called *Missa*, because it is transmitted first from the Father to us, that it may be with us; and afterwards from us to the Father, that it may intercede for us with the Father."

These words describe this doctrine at a very early stage of its development, and give two very different explanations of the word *Mass*, the first of which does not at all express the present advanced state of the Romish or Tridentine theory. But we can see, even in this early stage of the doctrine, as it appears in the second explanation of the word *Mass* given by Hugo de St. Victor, what was really taught, viz.: 1. That the words of the priest in consecration of the elements bring down Christ from His sitting at the right hand of the Father, from heaven to earth; 2. That by the oblation of the mass He is sent up again, and offered up to the Father; and 3. That all this is done to the end that He may intercede with the Father for us.

The first observation which suggests itself upon this statement is that it seems to imply an entirely new kind of sacrifice, unknown both to Jews and Christians. It seems essential to the very notion of a sacrifice that we should sacrifice of our own; that that which we offer unto God should be something of which we deprive ourselves. Thus, David refused to sacrifice unto the Lord his God of that which

cost him nothing (2 Sam. xxiv., 24), even though it had become his own by the free gift of Araunah. Thus, also, we are said in Scripture and in ancient authors to offer unto God the sacrifice of prayer and praise, to offer unto Him our good works, our tears of contrition, our alms deeds, and our repentance: these are the only unbloody sacrifices which were known to the primitive Church, and of these, the Scriptures themselves speak in the language of sacrifice; for we may remember the words of the angel to Cornelius: Thy prayers and thine alms are come up for a memorial before God; as also the words of the Psalmist: Let my prayer come before Thee as incense—the lifting up of my hands as the evening sacrifice.

If, then, it be essential to a sacrifice that we offer unto the Lord of our own, in what sense can we be said to offer or sacrifice unto Him the body and blood of Christ, which He has sent down to us?

We know of no answer to this, unless it be said that Christ by being sent down from the Father into the hands of the priest is thereby made ours, and that we may, therefore, offer Him up again in sacrifice unto God.

But, besides that this does not make Him ours, in the same sense in which our prayers, our good works, or even the victims offered up in bloody sacrifice under the law were ours; it seems a strange and unaccountable use to make of so great a gift of God, as the real, nay the bodily, presence of Christ with us, that we should instantly, as soon as we have received Him, call upon the angels to carry Him back again to the Father. For so says the prayer in the canon of the mass which immediately follows the consecration:—

"We humbly beseech Thee, Almighty God, to command these gifts, by the hands of Thy Holy Angel, to be borne to Thy high altar, into the presence of Thy Divine Majesty."

This, we repeat, seems a strange use to make of the Body, and Blood, Soul, and Divinity of our Lord and Saviour, thus actually sent down to us from heaven to earth, to send Him back to heaven again, and, like the Gadarenes of old, to pray him that as soon as possible he would depart out of our coasts.

Again, secondly, we may ask to what use are all these things? Wherefore is the Lord sent down from heaven on earth? And wherefore is He again carried back to heaven again, by the ministry, as we are told, of the holy angels?

Must we think that the most precious body of Christ is more acceptable to God when lying on an altar, under the sacramental species, than when it was offered on the cross? Must we suppose that the intercession of Christ is more efficacious after having been thus sent down from heaven, and thus at our prayer sent back to heaven again, by the ministry of angels, than it is when He is sitting in His own proper form, as well as substance, at the right hand of the Majesty on high? Must we believe that the adorable sacrifice of the ever blessed Son of God becomes more holy in itself or more efficacious, more acceptable to the Father, and more propitiatory for our sins, by being offered up again and again from the altars of the Christian Church? and if so, is it the hand that offers it, or is it the repetition of the offering, that give it this renewed and augmented efficacy?

3. These questions are difficult to answer on the Romish theory; but before we proceed to any further consideration of them, we would remark, thirdly, that St. Paul draws a parallel between our Lord's entering the sanctuary on high with His own blood and the high priest of the Jews once in the year entering the Holy of Holies with the blood of bulls and goats.

This parallel the Romish theory altogether overturns and destroys. 1st. Because it never was heard of that the blood of any lawful sacrifice, after it had been carried by the high priest into the Holy of Holies, was ever after brought forth again and offered upon the altar. The blood with which the high priest entered into the holiest place remained there for ever, and that which was brought forth was not the blood, but the blessing purchased by that blood.

2nd. The Romish theory is inconsistent with the parallel drawn by St. Paul in a still more essential and important respect. St. Paul speaks of the sacrifice of Christ as once, and but once, offered; he insists on this in his comparison of it with the sacrifice of the law on the great day of atonement. As the high priest, he says, entered into the Holiest alone, once in every year, so Christ, a high priest of good things to come, not by the blood of goats and calves, but by His own blood, entered in once into the holy place. And again, he says, that Christ is not to offer Himself often, as the high priest entereth into the holy place every year; for then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world; but now once in the end of the world hath He appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself.

Nothing, therefore, can be more certain from this language of St. Paul than that the sacrifice of Christ was to be once and once only offered unto the Father; and nothing can be more certain than that the Roman Church, in the sacrifice of the mass, pretends to offer Him up unto the Father, over all the world, from every altar, thousands and thousands of times every day.

There is scarcely anything in the whole doctrine of the

Mass with which the advocates of the Romish theory seem so hopelessly embarrassed as in the attempt to reconcile these statements of Holy Scripture with their teaching, and it will be very instructive to consider briefly the shifts to which they are driven.

Bellarmino, for example (*De Sacr. Eccl. l. v. c. 25, n. 8*), gives this solution of the difficulty: that Christ, indeed, was never offered more than once, under His own form and figure, upon the cross, with shedding of His blood, and in death; but that this does not hinder His being offered as often as we please upon the altar, without shedding of blood.⁴

So that, according to this theory, when the Apostle says that the sacrifice of Christ was, and needed to be, but once offered, his meaning is that Christ was sacrificed but once under His own proper form and figure; but this does not hinder His being sacrificed again and again—"non excludit (to use the words of Bellarmine) iterationem oblationis Christi"—and that, according to the Romish doctrine, as really as if He were in His own proper form and figure, under the form or species of the bread and wine, on every Christian altar.

We are, therefore, called upon, in conformity with this explanation of the Apostle's words, to believe, that although St. Paul denies in the plainest terms, and without any exception or reservation whatsoever, that the sacrifice of Christ was more than once offered; yet, in point of fact, it is many times daily offered—really, actually offered and sacrificed on every altar, as truly as it was offered on the cross; and that although the Apostle speaks absolutely, and makes no exception, he did, nevertheless, reserve to himself certain limitations, not intending to deny that the sacrifice of Christ could in any form be repeated or reiterated, but only that it could be repeated in that shape and form in which He hung upon the cross, and in which He actually suffered death.

He that can read the epistle to the Hebrews, and think such an explanation of the Apostle's meaning tenable, or even plausible, would seem to be beyond the reach of any arguments.

4. Having made these general observations on the doctrine of the oblation of Christ in the Mass, as it is explained by Romish divines, let us now consider briefly that other part of the doctrine, wherein it is said that preparatory to that oblation Christ is sent down by the Father into the hands of the priest, in order that He may be sacrificed and offered up unto the Father again.

For this purpose, the first thing that is necessary (we are told) is that the priest who consecrates should intend to consecrate; for without this intention nothing is done, and that not only when he intends not to consecrate, or (to use the words of the rubric of the Missal) when he intends to act deceitfully,⁵ but also when he falls from mere oblivion or infirmity, or oversight.⁶

We shall not stop to discuss the various cases and difficulties stated even in the rubric of the Missal itself as resulting from this doctrine of intention, explain as it has been by Romish casuists, nor shall we now examine the consequences, fatal to the Romish doctrine, which follow from it.

Our more immediate purpose is to examine the mode in which, according to the theory of Rome, the Body, Blood, Soul, and Divinity of our Lord are brought down from heaven, and placed in the hands of the priest, to be offered up in sacrifice to the Father.

This cannot be effected without a series of the most stupendous and astonishing miracles.

When the priest, supposing him to intend to consecrate, supposing also that there are no hosts on the altar, or portion of the wine which he overlooks, *ex oblivione*; supposing him, in short, to be in all respects duly qualified; when the priest utters the five words, *hoc est enim corpus meum*, the following miracles immediately take place:—

(1.) In the first place, the substance of as many wafers as are laid before him, and are present to his intention, is instantaneously annihilated, the figure, form, and species still remaining; and it may be well, perhaps, to remind the reader that by *form*, in the old philosophy of the schools, upon which this theory is built, is meant, not outward appearance, or figure (as we would now most probably understand by the word), but all essential properties, as taste, and colour, smell, figure, touch, and all such qualities as can affect the senses: these are all supposed to remain, unaltered and unimpaired, and yet the substance to which they before belonged, and in which they inhered, is utterly annihilated and destroyed. This, then, is the first great miracle.

(2.) A second miracle is this, that although the wafer, or, what is the same thing, its substance, is thus absolutely annihilated, yet the form or aggregate of its sensible qualities is made to support itself on mere vacuity, without its natural substance, and continues to affect the senses, to excite in us the same ideas of taste, and smell, and colour, and figure, as before, so that the most minute observation, the most exact and nicest senses, can detect no change; the wafer appears to the senses a wafer, and continues to possess apparently all the properties and qualities of a wafer, although in reality no wafer is there. This is a second great and astounding miracle.

⁴ "Videmus igitur Apostolum non excludere quantitas iterationem oblationis Christi, sed esse unum, quod mortem ipsius requirit."

⁵ "D. Iussu rei, sed agere."
⁶ Item si aliquis hostiam ex oblivione remaneat in altari, vel aliqua pars vini, vel aliqua hostia lateat, cum non intendat consecrare nisi quas videt.

* "Hujus Concilii aliquot canones sub nomine Nicenensi Synodi citantur et allegantur: vel quia tota Sardicensis Synodus Nicenense confirmatio, eaque tantum quod interpretatur, ideoque cum Nicenensi una eademque Synodus habita fuerit; vel quod a Nicenensi vere eadem ante quidem constituta fuerint, sed ab ipso Nicenensi concilio hi cum multis aliis existerent; vel quod quia utriusque Synodi canones collector nomine et titulo Sardicensis, quod ab Arianis valde diffamatum fuerat, expuncto, ita coejuerunt, ut omnes unus Concilii concilii canones esse viderentur. Posterior ratio Baronius et Bellarminus locis supra allegatis probabilior esse videtur."—Labbe and Coss. II., 630.

* "Missa autem dicta est quasi transmissa vel quasi transmissio: eo quod populus dum per ministerium sacerdotis, qui mediatoris vice fungitur inter hominem et hominem, preces et vota et oblationes Domino transmittit. Ipsa enim Hostia sacra missa vocari solet, quia transmissa est primum scilicet a Patre nostro ut nobiscum esset: postea a nobis Patri in apud Patrem pro nobis intercederet."—Lib. 2, D. Sacramentis, p. 8, c. 14.

^b "Supplices te rogamus omnipotens Deus, jube hoc perferri per manus sancti angeli tui in sublimi altare tuum, in conspectu divinae maiestatis tue."

^c Heb. ix. 7, sq.

(3.) A third miracle consists in bringing down from heaven the substance of the Body and Blood of Christ. On this part of the subject it is difficult to speak with that reverence which a topic so truly awful demands; suffice it, therefore, to say, that according to this doctrine of the Church of Rome, the same five words which, pronounced by the priest, have wrought upon each and every wafer which he intends to consecrate the two stupendous miracles of which we have spoken, works also upon the Body and Blood of Christ, as He is sitting at the right hand of God, similar miracles, with this exception only, that whereas the substance of the bread was annihilated, the substance of the body of Christ is only separated from its form and sensible species, and brought down from heaven, in this miraculous state of separation, into the hands of the priest.

(4.) A fourth miracle is this: the substance of the Body of Christ, thus separated from its form, and brought down from heaven, is miraculously inserted into the spaces left void by the annihilation of the substance of the wafers; and, notwithstanding the narrow dimensions of the voided space, and the far greater bulk previously occupied by the substance of our Saviour's Body, the latter is miraculously substituted for the former, without any alteration in the outward appearance, weight, figure, taste, or other sensible qualities of the wafer, and without its being possible for the most acute sense, or the most minute examination, to detect the smallest difference in any of these qualities after transubstantiation, from those which the wafer exhibited before.

(5.) A fifth miracle consists in the actual multiplication of the substance of our Lord's Body thus marvellously brought down from heaven, so that the whole, and entire, and unbroken, or undiminished Body of Christ shall be found at one and the same moment in all and every one of the wafers or fragment of the wafers, thus consecrated. Nay, though a thousand priests were consecrating at the same moment at a thousand altars, in all the ends of the earth, each and all the wafers on all these thousand altars and every fragment of those wafers, should alike possess the substance of Christ's body in lieu of their own annihilated substance, and possess it undiminished and unbroken, so that in each one of these wafers, nay in each fragment of these wafers, the whole and perfect Body of the Lord is concealed, and, as it were, multiplied *ad infinitum*.

These five miracles, wrought upon the bread, or wafer, by the intention of the priest and the repetition of the sacred words of consecration, are repeated in the same order and manner upon the consecrated wine: the substance of the wine is annihilated, the form or sensible qualities of the wine are still preserved, and made to affect the senses as before; the substance of Christ's Blood is brought down from heaven, separated from its form; it is inserted into the vacuum created by the annihilation of the wine; and, lastly, the same multiplication of the Blood is miraculously effected, so that in every the minutest drop or particle of the transubstantiated wine the whole Blood of Christ is contained, and taken by the communicant who is privileged to drink it.

6. The above ten miracles are absolutely essential to every mass, and without them the transubstantiation could not be effected. But great and stupendous as they are, are not even yet sufficient to complete the Roman theory, or to protect the doctrine it involves from all its difficulties.

It has sometimes happened that the consecrated hosts, kept too long, have become corrupt like ordinary wafers, and even given birth to worms; that the consecrated wine, in like manner, has become vinegar, and mouldy, even like common wine. How is this, if their substance has been annihilated? and if in its place has been substituted the incorruptible substance of the Body and Blood of Christ?

To meet this and similar difficulties new miracles are necessary; but in discussing this subject we cannot trust ourselves to speak except in the language of Romanist divines themselves.

The question is this:—since the Eucharist, or consecrated Host, possesses no substance, except the substance of the Body of Christ, and since corruption cannot take place except in substance (for these positions are admitted by the school divines), what are we to conclude from the fact, which is also admitted, that the consecrated host may become mouldy and corrupt? This corruption cannot take place in the substance of that Body of which it is written, that He shall see no corruption; and, therefore, to meet the difficulty, Romanist divines are under the necessity of having recourse to another miracle, by supposing that before this corruption takes place the substance of Christ's body, of its own accord, departs from the consecrated wafer; that the substance of the wafer which had been annihilated, or some equivalent substance, is spontaneously created again, and restored to its original place; so that the Host again, of its own accord (or rather without any additional act on the part of the priest), by a new miracle, becomes an ordinary wafer, and that as soon as this change is effected the work of corruption instantaneously begins and goes on according to the usual laws of nature.

This theory is thus stated by the celebrated Duns Scotus.*

* Sive per alterationem, sive per motum in quantitate corruptatur eucharistia, redit de facto substantia: et hoc est substantia composita cui talia accidentia convenient quæ etiam afficiunt; et hoc in instanti corruptionis et immediate a Deo.

Ima, pars hujus probatur, quia Deus statuit illas species manentes esse sine subjecto in eucharistia precise et non alibi, ergo statim quod cessante eucharistia non sunt species sine subjecto et per consequens in ipso instanti corruptionis fit ibi aliqua substantia.

"Whether the Eucharist be corrupted by alteration, or by motion in quantity, a substance, in fact, returns, and this is the same compound substance to which such accidents agree, and which they belong to. And this takes place in the very instant of the corruption and by the immediate interference of God."

His arguments in support of this theory are given in the original Latin, in the note, but it is not necessary for our present purpose to translate them, as we are only concerned with the theory itself.

(Continued in page 128.)

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We earnestly request our correspondents, both Protestants and Roman Catholics, to limit the length of their communications, when possible, and not in any case to discuss a variety of distinct topics in one letter.

To diminish the chance of disappointment, all letters should be forwarded to the office by the first day of the month.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nonsubscribers of the subscriber.

All letters meant for publication should be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-street, and the real name and address given, not necessarily for publication, but as a guarantee of good faith.

The CATHOLIC LAYMAN is registered for transmission beyond the United Kingdom.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, NOVEMBER 18, 1858.

WE have at length, from a source on which Roman Catholics may rely, the facts of the Mortara case. We give the following from the *Tablet* newspaper of November 6th, 1858:—

"From the *Univers* of Wednesday we learn that the facts of the case, which have to a certain extent been neglected, while the question was being discussed theoretically, are as follows:—In November, 1857, one Marianna Bajesi gave information to the ecclesiastical authorities at Bologna that the child of Salomon Mortara, a Modenese Jew, residing at Bologna, had been baptised. Her statement was, that a respectable person, seeing one of the children of Mortara at the point of death (this child did really die), advised the Mortaras' servant, Anna Morisi, to baptise it. The servant refused on the ground that some years before she had baptised another child of Mortara in a like danger; that this child (the subject of the present controversy) had not died, but had reached the age of seven years, and that she was greatly troubled about it. In consequence of the statement of Bajesi, Anna Morisi, the servant of Mortara, was summoned before the inquisitor, and declared on oath that Edgardo Mortara, the son of Salomon, who about two years old, was taken so violently ill that his father and mother were in tears, expecting, as did every one in the house, that it was about to die. A layman with whom the servant was conversing in this affliction told her that if the child was really in danger she would be doing a good action by baptizing it. She inquired how it was done. The neighbour instructed her minutely, and at night, the child being worse, and apparently about to breathe its last, she poured water on its head, saying, 'I baptise thee in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.' Being asked her intention in doing this, she replied that her intention was to baptise the child, according to the spirit of the Church, in order to save a soul. As a Christian, she wished that this soul should not be lost. She was under the conviction that it could not live. It becomes, therefore, clear that the child was baptised not only validly but licitly, according to the rule of Benedict XIV.

"Cum filius Hebræorum consignatus fuisset nutrici Christianæ, in deficientia nutrimenti Hebræorum, dum esset proximus morti fuit baptizatus et sacra congregatio declaravit prædictum puerum fuisse licite baptizatum.

"An attempt has been made to deny the danger of the child, and a certificate of the medical attendant has been produced, dated July 31, 1858, four years after the illness and baptism. The certificate, under the circumstances, is immaterial, and cannot displace the facts sworn to by the servant. To resume. We have the Modenese Mortaras voluntarily submitting themselves to the laws of the Roman State, and breaking these laws by retaining a Christian servant. We have this servant baptizing their child, legally and rightfully, according to her duty, when in danger of death. She certainly did not act from malice, for her master is satisfied with her, and retains her in his service. She certainly did not act from fanaticism, or

2da. pars probatur, quia si aliqua substantia redit, non alia quam illa quæ potest illi accidentibus novis affici, quia alia substantia non esset casus.

3ia. pars probatur, scilicet quod non redit immediate nisi a Deo, quia nullum a iud. agens habet virtutem activam ad hoc sufficientem, non ergo resit substantia composita dum accidentia eucharistia continentur. . . . nec redit materia sive per reparationem seu resurrectionem seu creationem, quia hoc esset omnino superfluum, cum per materiam solam non posset magis salvari actus aliquid agens naturalis. - Lib. iv. Sent. dist. 13, q. 6, c. Dico ergo.

These are scientific terms in the philosophy of that day, which it is not necessary for our present purpose to explain.

from a desire to make proselytes unfairly; for it was not she who revealed that she had baptised the elder child, and she refused to give baptism to the younger, who unfortunately died. All the declamations that we read have no other base than these facts."

But softly, good *Tablet*; do take a little time, and finish the facts; for more facts there are in this case as a base for "declamation."

What a harmless "inquisitor!" He only sent for the servant girl, Anna Morisi, and asked her just to tell him the story! And is it for that little harmless curiosity of an "inquisitor" that all Europe, Protestant and Roman Catholic (all except Ireland), is ringing with shouts of "shame" against the Pope and his government?

There are some other little facts in the case, and the *Tablet* knows them very well, but leaves it to us to tell them.

"Inquisitors" of the Church of Rome were once terrible indeed to parents and to children. Many a broken heart has cursed them in its bitterness or died in its despair, at the desolation of parental or filial affection. And terrible indeed these "inquisitors" seem now resolved to make themselves again to parents and to children.

This "inquisitor," on hearing the story of Anna Morisi, did do something further. He sent the police to tear this child of seven years of age from the arms of its father and its mother, and to announce to them that their child they should never see again!

There is another fact yet:

The distracted parents appealed to the Pope, that kind, benevolent, old man, Pius IX.—their spiritual father—their temporal sovereign—bound alike in both capacities to do them justice.

The Pope has decreed that the inquisitor did right, and that the bereaved parents shall never have their child again!

The parents have besought the holy father that they might, at the least, be allowed to look upon their child once more.

Letters from Rome state that the Pope told them they should see their child once more. On that they set off to the place of his confinement, and then they were told they should never see it; and they were hunted out of the town by the police, on the pretence that they had no "passports." We presume that the "inquisitor" will take due care that they are not to have passports for that town in future.

These are additional facts, on which not merely "declamation," but a cry of indignation has been raised by every civilized country at the conduct of the Pope.

We believe that every newspaper in Roman Catholic France, except the *Univers* (the French *Tablet*), has joined in this cry. Russia, Italy, Germany, Belgium, have re-echoed it. All Europe is ringing with it. So loud is the cry, and so much is the Pope frightened, that, it seems, his holiness has already found it necessary to write to every court in Europe to try and excuse his conduct. We take the following from the same number of the *Tablet*:—

"A letter in the *Emancipation* of Brussels says: That the holy father had addressed a note to the European Courts on the Mortara case. The note sets forth the parent's petition, relates the circumstances under which the child was baptised, and declares that the baptism is irrevocable. The attacks which have been made on religion and the holy father, in connection with this affair, are left unnoticed."

The Pope still maintains his wrongful act, and the *Tablet* still defends it, though both evidently in terror at the storm of outraged feeling that is every day getting louder throughout Europe.

How critical the outcry is getting may appear from the fact that the *Tablet*, which has hitherto tried not to speak of the subject, has no less than three articles on it in the number for November 6. We now proceed to examine the article containing their defence of the Pope's act.

"We owe an apology to our subscribers for troubling

them again with the 'affair Mortara,' which is a plain question of the *Catechism*, requiring no learning for its solution—only a little grace to receive it as it ought to be received. But, unfortunately, that little grace is wanting to the furious infidels who create the disturbance, and darken a question clear as the sun at noon. The child Mortara has acquired rights which no human power can take away, but by violence, and for the loss of which no government can ever make any compensation. The act which made him a Christian is irrevocable, beyond the powers of any tribunal to annul, and by that act he became as a dead child to his Hebrew father (so far as the authority of the latter over his religion was concerned), as completely as if he had died a natural death. Neither he nor his parents, it is true, consented to the deed; but that absence of consent cannot vitiate it, because the act of baptism, once validly complete, remains for ever indelible, whatever may be his education or the future habits of his life."

We ask attention to the admission here made, that this outrage on the common feelings and rights of humanity is a necessary consequence of the Roman doctrine about baptism. From which alone, those who understand the simplest rules of Christian action which the Gospel teaches, may assume that doctrine of baptism to be erroneous.

We proceed now to examine the justification of this outrage:—

"As to the act of baptism and the absence of parental consent, that is easily disposed of, like all other irrevocable acts to which human life is liable. So far as the Jews are concerned, it is an accident which they could not prevent; they **LOST THEIR CHILD** by baptism, as they might have lost it by fire or sudden death. Every family is exposed to some danger or other in rearing their infants; nurses may be careless, and thereby occasion mutilation, loss of eyes, or broken limbs. The matter is irrevocable, and people must endure what they were unable to prevent."

And again:—

"It may be hard upon individuals that they should suffer, without remedy, the consequence of a single act to which they were not parties at all, still less consenting parties. But such is the condition of human life, we are all liable to losses from the acts of others, and cannot protect ourselves."

This argument might have been more briefly expressed thus: "Let the Jew dogs grin, and bear it."

The *Tablet* admits that this defence applies to loss by fire as well as to "loss by baptism." Well, there have been losses by fire too. Parents have lost their children by fire, and children have lost their parents by fire, when Roman inquisitors have burned those children or parents in the fire, for the good of their souls. And the defence of the *Tablet* for tyranny and cruelty is just as good for this case as for loss by baptism: "The matter is irrevocable, and people must endure what they were unable to prevent!" But is that any excuse for those who perpetrated the outrage, or who could have prevented or remedied it, and would not?

We have yet another article. The *Tablet* can be very virtuously indignant at any interference between parent and child when any excuse can be found for charging it on Protestants. The Pope can't bear to see parental feeling outraged by any one else—because that is the exclusive privilege of himself and his religion.

The *Tablet* quotes an article from the *Morning Star*, headed "Protestant Missionaries in India."

The facts were briefly these. A native Indian placed a son at a native school. The boy got among Christians, and wished to be a Christian. The missionaries received him into their house. The father came to take him away. The missionaries left the boy to his own free choice, to go or stay. The boy refused to go with his father. The father brought the case by *habeas corpus* before Sir C. Rawlinson, Chief Justice of Madras. The case turned on the age of the boy, as British law will not allow a boy under 14 years of age to absent himself from the house of his father. The boy stated that he was 16 years of age; the father stated that he was 13. No clear evidence was given on either side. Sir C. Rawlinson ordered the boy to be restored to his father. A year hence the boy will be allowed to act for himself in choosing his own religion.

On this the *Tablet* observes—

"... As for the parent, in the language

of our Parsee correspondent, 'He goes home with a broken heart.' And this is no isolated case, but happens in hundreds of instances. All which we commend to the attention of the press, which is so actively espousing the cause of the young Mortara's father.—Ed. *Tablet*."

We give it our attention, and we ask our readers to "look upon this picture and on that."

The Indian boy is 13 years old, at least, and has evidently a will of his own about choosing his own religion, and voluntarily leaves his father. Yet the British judge restores him to the custody and control of his father.

The Italian boy is only seven years old, and, of course, is incapable of making any choice of a religion for himself. This child is dragged out of his parents' arms, by the most tyrannical police in the world. The Roman judge (the Pope himself) refuses to give up the child to the outraged parents. And the Pope refuses on the ground that his religion teaches and requires him to support and maintain such an outrage as this.

We trust our readers will weigh and compare the comparative merits of British and of Roman law.

We ask our Protestant readers to consider that it is in the power of any Roman Catholic nurse employed by Protestant parents to baptize by stealth the infant entrusted to her care; and if she does so even in the dead of night, without its parents' knowledge or consent, still, if the Pope be right in the *Mortara* case, such child thereby becomes *his* subject; and it will be his duty and privilege (if in his power) to drag it from its Protestant parents and bring it up a Roman Catholic. Nay, we see not why his claim should not extend to every Protestant child baptized with water in the name of the Holy Trinity, no matter by whom performed, as even lay baptism, though by heretical hands, is universally recognised as a *valid* baptism by the ecclesiastical laws of Rome as well as of England.

We ask our Roman Catholic readers to conceive their own feelings if an armed police should enter their house to tear out of their arms for ever a child of seven years old, to educate him as a Protestant. We ask them next to consider and apply that great law of Christ, "All things, therefore, whatsoever you would that men should do to you, do you also to them. For this is the law and the Prophets" (Mat. vii. 12, Douay Bible).

Let them, then, try the act of the Pope by the law of Christ. And let them consider what St. Paul says of that law:—"The law is not made for the just man, but for the unjust and disobedient. . . . for men stealers!" (1 Tim. i. 9, 10, Douay Bible). The Pope is the man stealer just now; and that law is for him, if he will submit himself to the law of Christ.

"The Cardinal's fast," and the bill of fare on which he fasted, which we were the first to publish, and which, with our translation, was inserted in full in the *Times* of the 4th inst., has obtained a world-wide notoriety in the columns of that journal.

We take the following from the *Tablet* of November 6:—

"The *Times* of Thursday gave a short report of the Cardinal Archbishop's lecture in one column, and side by side with it a letter headed 'A Cardinal's fast,' and containing the bill of fare of the Dundalk banquet, at which his Eminence was a guest. The day was Friday, Sept. 3, a day of abstinence, and the dinner was a fish dinner. As to the dishes on the table, the *Times* correspondent may be safely left to the committee and the cook, the only responsible parties. A worthy correspondent writes to us by no means to pass this over, and to note especially that the 3rd September was not a fast day, but a simple day of abstinence from flesh meat, &c., &c. But when the *Times* stoops so low as to these miserable *petiteses*, is it not better to leave it to the verdict of the public?"

The *Tablet* appears to feel that the subject is a tender one. We have, however, elicited the important admission that Friday is *not* a fast day, and that the observances of Roman Catholics on

that day is *not* fasting. When those observances come under discussion hereafter, let both Protestants and Catholics remember that any argument drawn from Scripture or experience, or any other source, to prove the use and advantage of *fasting*, will be wholly beside the question. The Friday observance must henceforward be defended on some grounds wholly distinct from *fasting*.

The *Tablet* concludes thus:—

"If the editor of the *Times* had come to the Cardinal's lecture, and sought to lessen the effect of his discourse, by shouting any of the slang inquiries of the London gamins, it would have had as much effect, and been as much beneath notice."

The allusion appears to be to a well known popular inquiry, which is seldom replied to. In the case of "the fast," however, the inquiry which we stirred up has elicited an important admission.

THE SACRIFICE IN THE MASS AND TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

(Continued from page 127.)

We omit the question which is at issue between the Scotists and Thomists, whether the sacramental species can produce a substance; it must suffice to observe that St. Thomas Aquinas thinks they can; therefore, in his theory a less expenditure of miracle is necessary. Scotus, however, maintains that "nothing can corrupt a substance, unless it has the power of producing a substance; but mere species cannot produce substance in any given matter;" from which he infers, as we have seen, that the production of a new substance, which is necessary in order to explain the phenomenon of corruption, must be the immediate work of God Himself.

The arguments of Scotus, Thomas Aquinas, William Ockam, Alexander de Hales, &c., are given and discussed at length in Gabriel Biel's celebrated exposition of the canon of the Mass (Lect. 45); who also at some length argues the question whether the species of the wine can of themselves inebriate, and on this point he quotes the sentiments of Alex. Alensis and St. Bonaventure. The other party, however, of the schoolmen denied that this power of inebriating could belong to the mere species, and, therefore, maintained the doctrine that a miraculous restoration of their natural substances took place in this case also, as well as in the case of corruption.

Then comes another great question, whether the sacramental species communicate to the body of the recipient any nutriment. On this, in like manner, the schools are divided, the same party who attribute an inebriating quality to the species finding no difficulty, of course, in attributing to them a nutritive quality also. But here starts up a new difficulty, and with it the necessity for a new miracle; the species, if it be nutritive, must, in order to be so, be converted into the substance of the body of the recipient; for this is what is meant by nutrition; but species, being of its own essence distinct from substance, cannot be converted into substance; therefore, we must suppose that at the instant when the process of digestion commences, the substance of Christ's body is withdrawn and the original substance of the bread and wine miraculously restored.

This theory is thus stated by Biel.^k

"Hence, it appears that the sacramental species are nutritive; and that in giving nutriment to him who receives the Eucharist, they are converted into the substance of the body of him who takes them, not the very species, because species cannot be converted into substance. But a nutritive substance produced anew on the instant of the departure of the Body of Christ, refreshes and nourishes altogether, as if bread had been converted into nutriment."

Again, the sacrament may chance to be eaten by a mouse, or it may accidentally fall into a fire, and be reduced to ashes: in such cases new questions arise, which are solved in a similar manner. On this subject, Biel cites the authority of Pope Innocent,^l to the effect "that the Body of the Lord in such cases instantly disappears, and a new substance, as a support to the accidents, is miraculously created and substituted; or that the natural substances of the elements, which had been annihilated, are

^k "Nihil potest corrumpere substantiam nisi habeat virtutem producendi substantiam; sed species non possunt producere substantiam in quacunque materia."

^l "Virtus naturalis relictis in speciebus naturaliter potest immutari sensus: unde bene concedo quod virtus vitalis mirabiliter relictis in specie potest naturaliter agere in gustum, et in tanta quantitate potest sustinere quod inebriaret naturaliter."

^m "Et illo patet quod species sacramentalis nutrit, et quod in nutritione sumuntur eucharistici convertuntur in substantiam corporeis sumuntur; non enim species illis: quia species in substantiam converti non possunt. Sed sacramentalis substantia de novo produci in instanti desolatis corpora Christi reficit et nutrit per omnia, ac si panis conversus fuisset in nutrimentum."

ⁿ "Et si quaeratur quid a mure comedatur? vel quod indecideret cum sacramentum crearetur? Respondetur, quod acut miraculose substantia panis convertitur in corpus Domini, et incipit esse sacramentum, sic ipsa quodammodo miraculose reverteretur cum ipsum corpus Domini in illud desinit esse. Neque enim in alio operibus miraculose expleto officio propter quod condita erat, illa que mirabiliter erant condita reducta sunt in primum statum, sicut dicitur de columba in qua apparuit Spiritus Sanctus, viz., quod peracto officio suo in praesentem rediit materiam unde assumpta est; similiter et stellae magorum dicitur: quod peracto officio mox esse desinit, reverens in praesentem naturam unde sumpta fuerat. ac dicitur esse in proposito, quod quando species desinunt esse sacramentum, substantiae naturales specierum in eam reverterentur statim, sicut prius fuerunt miraculose transmutatae."

miraculously reproduced." This is also the opinion of Alex. Alensis and of Bonaventura.

Biel then proceeds to give the theories of other schoolmen, who seek to introduce more of natural causes; but with these we shall not trouble our readers.

Durandus, another famous schoolman, in his commentary on the Book of Sentences, defends the same theory, and his words may also be quoted.²⁴

"We see that worms are generated from the species of the sacrament when carelessly kept; it is necessary, therefore, that by Divine power, some matter, whatsoever it be, should be introduced, because what is generated cannot be the existing form, but is compounded of matter and form. The same opinion must be held as to the question whether the sacramental species can give nutriment; because, since nutrition consists in this, that the matter of the thing nourishing is under the form of the nourished, and since there is no matter under the sacramental species, therefore, it is necessary that matter should be created anew, under those species, by Divine power in order that there be nutrition."

These citations are sufficient to give a specimen of the speculations to which the doctrine of transubstantiation leads its advocates. Our readers will observe that it requires us to believe, without any authority either from the Holy Scriptures, or from our senses, or from reason, that ten miracles are immediately wrought—miracles, too, of a most strange and unaccountable character—"on the priest pronouncing the five words of consecration, 'Hoc enim est corpus meum.' It requires also two other miracles (the withdrawing of the body of Christ, and the restoration of the substance of the elements or some other newly created substance) whenever the process of digestion, or corruption, or any other kind of destruction, takes place in the sacramental elements.

When we say that for this great series of marvels we have neither the authority of Scripture, nor of sense, nor of reason, we do not mean to assert that reason or sense is a judge in such a matter, provided we had any testimony of revelation on which faith could rest; but having, as is admitted, no such testimony for any such miracles as are supposed to follow on the words of consecration, and these miracles being from their very nature beyond the cognizance of sense, it is not unfair to ask what purpose so vast a machinery of miracle is supposed to serve. We do not see in the acknowledged miraculous dealings of God with man that He was ever wont to break through the ordinary laws of nature without an end and without an object; and, therefore, it cannot be unreasonable to inquire what end is served by all this expenditure of miracle which the doctrine of transubstantiation requires. That it is not intended for the conviction of unbelievers is manifest from this, that the miracles it involves are not addressed to the sight or sense, but altogether to faith, and, therefore, it is to be supposed that if these invisible miracles be wrought at all, they are wrought for the benefit and spiritual sustenance of the faithful.

But if so, where lies the great benefit of transubstantiation, and all the subtleties of metaphysics to which it leads, over and above the true and ancient doctrine of our Lord's Real Presence with us in the Holy Communion? If He be indeed present with us as we believe; if He give us verily and indeed His flesh to eat and His blood to drink in that Holy Sacrament, wherefore should we ask for more? nay, what more, after all, can we have? what more have they, or rather what more do they suppose themselves to have, who believe in the existence of all this mighty series of secret and invisible miracles? and if not, if our doctrine of the Real Presence gives to the apprehension of our faith all that the doctrine of transubstantiation pretends to give; if, after all, we believe that we eat Christ's Flesh and drink His Blood, (content to believe so, on His most sacred Word alone, without seeking to discover how or in what way so great a mystery is effected) what more does Transubstantiation give us? for if the mighty series of miracles supposed in this doctrine were even true, they could give to us no more than that which the true Catholic faith has given us already, namely, that the Body and Blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's supper.

In the absence, therefore, of any better reason for believing in these miracles than the mere speculations of the schoolmen (for this, after all, is the only reason on which they rest), and seeing, as we do, that they are altogether superfluous and unnecessary, giving to the faith of the Church nothing which we do not already possess in the Catholic doctrine of the Real Presence of our Saviour's most blessed Body and Blood, we may well be excused for doubting whether a belief in the existence of all these marvels be necessary to salvation and an article of faith. We may strengthen ourselves in the assurance that we cannot be wrong in protesting against the authority of that corrupt communion that would thus add to the articles of the creed a grievous yoke, which neither we nor our fathers were able to bear. If there be a schism in the Church in consequence, the guilt of it must rest with those who seek to force upon the brethren such unheard of novelties, and if they repent not at our faithful and affectionate remonstrance, we can have no answer left with which to reply to their importunities but the sacred warning of the Apostle: "if we, or an angel from heaven, preach to you any other gospel than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed."²⁵

"Videmus enim ex speciebus ac rebus inchoare corpora, et materia generari: oportet ergo quod virtute divina adhibita materia qualitercunque hoc sit, quia genitum non est forma subsistens, sed est compositum ex materia et forma. Idem videtur esse sententiam ad species sacramentales postquam nutritur, quia cum nutritio fiat per hoc quod materia alibi sit super forma nutriti et sub speciebus sacramentalibus nulla est materia, sed oportet quod de novo fiat ibi materia virtute Divina ad hoc, ut sit nutritio."—Lib. 4, dist. 14, q. 2, n. 10.

Correspondence.

THE HOLY FATHERS ACKNOWLEDGED THE POPE'S SUPREMACY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

(Continued from page 116.)

XXVI. St. Basil, who was Bishop of Cæsarea, in Cappadocia anno 370, says: "Peter has heard that he is a rock, being told so by Christ. For though he also was a rock, yet he was not such a rock as Christ. He was such a rock as Peter. For Christ is a rock in itself immovable, and Peter only from him" (Hom. 28, tom. i. p. 531).

XXVII. And writing to Pope Damasus, concerning the troubles of the Eastern Churches: "Bereft," says he, "of all hope, we have come to the determination of imploring you, that you would be moved to assist us—that you would send some persons who are of your own and of our mind, who might point out to you who the movers of these dissensions are; so that it may be clear to you with whom you ought to hold communion. In this we require nothing new, nothing but what has been usual towards other God-beloved men of old, and especially towards you. For we remember that Dionysius, that most saintly bishop, who was eminent among you for righteousness used to visit our Church, and console us by his letters." And again, to the same Pope, he says, "Eustatius of Sebaste (in Syria), having been deposed, went, as a way of being restored, unto you. And what the most holy Bishop Liberius said to him we know not, except that he brought back a letter which restored him, which, when the council of Thyana (in Asia Minor) saw, he recovered his see. Since, then, from you hath arisen his power to harm the churches, and he hath used the favour given him by you to the perversion of many, from you must come also the correction, and must be intimated, by writ, to the Churches, why he was received." (Tom. iii., p. 587, ed. 1839).

XXVIII. St. Jerome, who wrote about this time, in his reply to the question (started by the ancient innovator, Jovinian), viz., "In another place the Church is said to be built on all the Apostles, and they all received the keys," gives this decisive answer:—"But for this reason one is chosen out of the twelve, that a head being constituted, there might be no occasion of schism." Which ought to silence modern innovators also, when they dare to question the nature and degree of St. Peter's supremacy.

XXIX. Writing from the Syrian desert to Pope Damasus, he says, "I speak to the fisherman's successor, owning Christ to be chief. I am joined in communion with your holiness, that is, with the chair of Peter. On that rock I know the Church is built. Whoever eats the lamb out of this house is profane. If any one be not in the ark, he will perish. Whosoever gathers not with you, scatters; that is, he that is not Christ's is Antichrist's." Thus St. Jerome. And again: "As secretary to Damasus," says he, "I used to answer the Synodic consultations from the east and west."

XXX. And St. Ambrose, who was Bishop of Milan, anno 374:—"By ordinance, and by the custom of antiquity, they (the Bishops of Alexandria) are known to have appealed to the judgment of the Roman See, as did Athanasius of holy memory, and later still, Peter, Patriarch of Alexandria, and most of the orientals." To which I add the testimony (though it be 20 years later) of the African Bishop, St. Augustin: "An oriental Catholic," says he, "never wrote to the Bishop of Carthage, without writing to the Roman Bishop (Romano pretermissio)."

XXXI. St. Ambrose and the Council of Aquileia, to the Emperor Gratian: "Let not the Roman Church, which is the head of the whole Roman world, and the most holy faith apostolic, be molested; for from that Church flows into all nations the ordinance of the most revered communion."

XXXII. "As the whole world belongs to God," says St. Ambrose, or a contemporary, "yet is His house called the Church, which this day Damasus rules." (In Epist. ad Timoth. apud St. Ambros).

XXXIII. And to Pope Symplicius, St. Ambrose writes, "To our Lord, the well beloved Pope Symplicius. In the letter of thy Holiness we see the watchfulness of the good shepherd, who keepest the door entrusted to you, and, with holy anxiety, keepest the sheepfold of Christ. Worthy art thou whom the sheep of the Lord hear and follow." He ends thus: "So shalt thou know that Jovinian, Auxentius, Januarius, &c., whom thy Holiness hath condemned, are, according to your judgment, condemned here also."²⁶

He thus advises Theophilus: "You should, most assuredly, refer to the prelate of the Roman see, for we hope your decision will please him." (Ep. lvi. n. 7).

XXXIV. St. Chrysostom, Patriarch of Constantinople, anno 397, being persecuted by the Empress Eudoxia, has recourse to Pope Innocent I. though Constantinople, and not Rome, was then the seat of empire: "Display," says he, "I beseech you, that vigour and zeal which becomes you, so as to check the great wickedness that assails

the Churches. Vouchsafe that the evil deeds of this faction may have no force, and that the guilty be subjected to the laws of the Church, and allow us to enjoy, as once we did, your frequent letters, your love," &c. tom. iii. ep. l, p. 620.

XXXV. St. Augustin, Bishop of Hippo, in Africa, anno 395, to the Manicheans, who were vainly trying to draw him from the Church: "I am held to the Catholic Church," says he, "by a succession of bishops descending from the See of Peter, to whom Christ, after His resurrection, committed his flock, down to the present pastor: Lastly, the very name of Catholic holds me, of which this Church alone hath so kept possession, that though all heretics wish to be called Catholic, yet if a stranger ask them where Catholics meet, none of the heretics dare point out his own conventicle."²⁷

Could St. Augustin have foreseen that this would be acted over again, after the lapse of fourteen hundred and sixty years?

XXXVI. To the schismatic Donatists, who had the Creed, and all the Sacraments, he says: "Come, if you wish to be engrafted in the vine: we grieve to see you lying thus cut off. Count the bishops even from the very See of Peter; and see the whole succession in that line of Fathers: that is, the Rock which the proud gates of hell shall never overcome."

So much for what this saint thought of barren creeds and sacraments, when severed from the life-imparting root—from the see of Peter, the womb of Catholic unity, as it had, long before, been termed by St. Cyprian. And again says St. Augustin,

XXXVII. "Shall we hesitate to hide ourselves in that Church, which, by the confession of all mankind, hath obtained supreme authority from the Apostolic see, by the succession of Bishops, while heretics rave in vain around her!" (De util. cred., 17). Again:

XXXVIII. "He heeded not the legions of his enemies, while he saw himself in the communion of the Church of Rome, in which the supremacy of the Apostolic chair hath always reigned—when Africa obtained the Gospel—where he would be prepared to plead his cause, should his enemies dare to tamper with the faith of his Churches."

XXXIX. "I wish to examine," says he, "in a Council here whether those persons ought to be cast out of the Church and, if necessary, write to the Apostolic see, that it may be confirmed by authority what course we are to take in these cases."²⁸

XL. Pelagius, the arch-heretic of Britain, anno 414, in his profession of faith to Pope Innocent: "This is the faith, most holy Pope, which we have learned in the Catholic Church; and in which, if we err, we would fain be corrected by you, who hold both the faith and the Chair of Peter. But if this our confession is approved by your Apostleship, then whoever stigmatizes me, proves himself—even no Catholic—but certainly not me a heretic."²⁹

XLI. St. Augustin and the Numidian Bishops, anno 416, to Pope Innocent, on the occasion of the Pelagian heresy: "We would it were decided by you whether our little stream, however small, flows from the same head of rivers whence comes your own abundance."³⁰ And,

XLII. St. Augustin and the Council of Milevia, to the same Pope: "Since the Lord hath placed you in the Apostolic see, we would be justly blameable did we omit to name to your holiness, &c. We beseech you that you would deign to apply your pastoral care against the dangers—For a new and baneful heresy is on the wing. But we know, our Lord guiding you in your counsels, that they will more easily yield to the authority of your holiness, which is clearly derived from Scripture."³¹

XLIII. To whom the Pope replies: "Following the example of ancient tradition and ecclesiastical rule, you have, before pronouncing sentence, appealed to us, knowing what is due to the Apostolic see; since from the Apostle himself the very Episcopate, and all the authority of this rank hath sprung. Following whom, we know whom to condemn and to approve. Also keeping to the custom of the Fathers, ye trample not on their rules, which they, according to no human, but a divine, sentence have decreed; viz., that whatever was being carried on, though in the remotest provinces, should not be settled before it was brought to the knowledge of this see; by whose authority the sentence should be confirmed, and that hence all other Churches might learn what they should order, whom they should absolve, and whom the pure stream should shun."³² "Hence do ye zealously consult the apostolic dignity (on which hangs the care of all Churches) as to the judgment to be passed in doubtful matters, following herein the ancient rule, which you know, even as I do, hath always been observed throughout the whole world—answers being ever issuing from the apostolic origin to inquirers. Above all when the faith is in discussion, all our fellow-bishops can only refer to Peter, that is, to the origin of their name and dignity, just as you have now referred, for the common good of all the

²⁴ Lib. cont. ep. Fundament. c. 4.

²⁵ In Don. et. tom. ix.

²⁶ Tom. 2, col. 126, ep. 43, Glorio.

²⁷ Ibid. col. 1334, ep. ad Classic.

²⁸ Tom. x. App. 97.

²⁹ Tom. 2, ep. 177.

³⁰ Tom. 2, p. 328.

³¹ Co-stant. Ep. Rom. Pont. p. 863.

²⁴ Eph. ii. 20.

²⁵ Eps. 57.

²⁶ Eps. 123.

²⁷ Ad. II. col. 816. Ed. Ben. 1690.

²⁸ Tom. ix. p. 703. Ed. Ben. 1836.

²⁹ Tom. 2, epist. xi.

³⁰ Tom. 2, epist. xlii, p. 965.